



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

inclined to agree with the judgment of Lord Bryce, that these writings are worthy of preservation. They have qualities which raise them above the level of the majority of even the more philosophical journalistic summaries or criticisms. Inclusiveness of thought, tolerance, a fine sense of proportion—these are truly “literary” qualities, which, when supported by an unaffected grace of style, secure permanent freshness and value, giving pleasure and producing a superior sense of conviction.

These qualities are manifest in the opening article, to which the title *The New Politics* rightfully applies. In this the author describes the modern phase of democracy’s endless struggle with privilege, formulating with clearness and force a thought that has been gaining strength in the minds of many who are neither socialists nor extreme radicals. “Democracy’s task,” wrote Mr. Brown in 1910, “is twofold; it must secure for the State, the public, the people, some kind of effective, ultimate control over the natural sources of all wealth; and it must also secure in an industrial system no longer controlled by competition, protection and opportunity for the individual.” The change in the conditions that determine politics is thoroughgoing, epochal. Even now old issues are being reshaped, and in particular the struggle over the tariff is becoming “less and less a mere matter of conflicting sectional issues, less and less a matter of contrary economic theories, more and more a part and phase of the great struggle between democracy and privilege in industry.”

Mr. Brown was a particularly close and sympathetic student of the South, and his two articles relating to this section are genuinely informing. In “The White Peril” the position of the negro is discussed as affected by changed industrial conditions and by immigration. In “The South and the Saloon” the author, writing in 1908, pointed out the connection between the wide-spread temperance movement and the forms of religious belief most potent with the mass of the people. While somewhat skeptical regarding the permanent effect of a movement so largely inspired by a sort of camp-meeting fervor, he took the larger view that all moral progress is wavelike, and declared that whatever reaction might ensue, the saloon could never be again in the South what it had been in the past.

The articles contained in *The New Politics* are for the most part rather unambitious. In them there is little manifestation of what De Quincy called “a great combining intellect.” But they prove William Garrott Brown to have been a true critic and a writer capable of expressing in many cases with clarity and elegance, the sense and inwardness of enlightened, liberal opinion.

---

ARMS AND INDUSTRY. By NORMAN ANGELL. New York and London: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1914.

In Mr. Angell’s new book, which is largely a restatement and reinforcement of the doctrines set forth in *The Great Illusion*, there is much fundamental truth. With most of the author’s general contentions the majority of Americans, who are probably neither extreme militarists by temperament nor extreme imperialists by policy, will be little inclined to quarrel. And yet—searching as is Mr. Angell’s criticism of the assumption underlying militarism and “classical diplomacy”—the unprejudiced reader will perhaps feel the need now and then of the proverbial grain of salt.

As between Pacificists and Militarists the discussion has become a battle

of rival theories, with the result that upon either side hardly a statement is made that does not seem too sweeping, too little regardful of the essentially evolutionary nature of the whole problem. Mr. Angell, to say the least, indicates truly the *direction* of evolution with respect to war at the present time; nay, more, he proves it to have advanced farther than in some quarters has been realized. Yet he excites a certain distrust by talking as though the process could be completed almost immediately, and as if men could annul by an act of will the formative effect of the past. Says General Homer Lea: "National entities, in their birth, activities, and death are controlled by the same laws that govern all life—plant, animal, or national. Plans to thwart them, to short-cut them, to circumvent, to cozen, to deny, to scorn and violate them, are folly such as man's conceit alone makes possible. Never has this been tried—and man is ever at it—but what the result has been gangrenous and fatal." In such pronouncements there is an element of fatalism and of passionate belief in war as a necessary and permanent ingredient of human life. Mr. Angell replies with considerable pertinence that "this philosophy makes of man's acts, not something into which there enters the element of moral responsibility and free volition, something apart from and above the mere mechanical force of external nature, but it makes man himself a hopeless slave; it implies that his moral efforts and the efforts of his mind and understanding are of no worth—that he is no more master of his conduct than is the tiger of his, or the grass and trees of theirs; and no more responsible." Thus the discussion actually threatens to include the old problem of free will! But may it not be that the truth, so far as we can grasp it, lies between the extremes of absolute evolutionary law and absolute revolutionary free will? Nations, it would seem, are really organisms, governed in their growth by certain general laws analogous to those of physical organisms. Each has traditions, a character, aims, interest, sentiments, which represent—imperfectly, it is true, yet in a sense that still has meaning—the theoretic common aims and interests of its inhabitants. This, however, need not necessarily mean that public opinion and individual will are wholly unreal or powerless; nor that melioristic efforts—Mr. Angell's among the rest—are all in vain. The creed by which we live amounts to this: that between what is called immutable law in human affairs and what is called—with equal vagueness—free will, some sort of practical reconciliation is possible.

With an abundance of cool reason Mr. Angell points out that, as a result of the improvement of communication and the cheapening of transportation, "hostility based on the line of political geography" has become "irrelevant to real collision of interest and moral conflict." In this there is moral and economic common sense. It is evident that no two European nations display such difference of civilization as must lead to conflict; it is equally evident that the complexity of modern trade relations has brought about a manifold "intersection of political by international boundaries." At the same time we find it a trifle hard to believe that the governments of the world are all under a complete illusion regarding the economic effects of war. Is national evolution, we ask ourselves, capable of such an absolute *reductio ad absurdum*? The fact that each of the great Powers insists that its policy is purely defensive, disclaims the folly of invasion, and is obviously concerned about the peace of Europe, would seem to indicate that each has at stake real interests which are, after all, not easily separable from the national entity. The only rational explanation of their painful

efforts to adjust these interests by diplomacy and a show of force would seem to be that evolution—including the tendencies which Mr. Angell so ably synthetizes—has not yet gone far enough to make practicable anything like a parliament of the world.

As an arraignment of war in the abstract, as a criticism of the mere fetishism of nationality, as a summing up of the influences that are making the settlement of differences by armed conflict continually more illogical, *Arms and Industry*, like *The Great Illusion*, must have great weight. As a complete philosophy of international politics, it leaves us somewhat unsatisfied, because it seems to share in part the grandiose universality of the military theories it was written to confute. Most thinking men will wish Mr. Angell Godspeed in his efforts to hasten the coming of world-wide peace; not all will find in this book conclusive proof that only stupidity bars the way to the realization of that ideal.

---

THEY WHO KNOCK AT OUR GATES. By MARY ANTIN. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914.

The new book by the author of *The Promised Land* is essentially a plea—expressed with characteristic earnestness and charm—for altruism in national policy, for fairness, for sympathy. As such, it eminently deserves to be read—not that argumentatively it begins to cover the whole ground, but rather that through its intelligent emphasis upon the elements of idealism and humanity it adds something vital to a discussion that may easily become too exclusively scientific. Intuition, an intimate perception of what the immigrant thinks and feels, are of at least as much value as are tabulated facts and rows of figures.

“The Declaration of Independence, like the Ten Commandments, must be taken literally and applied universally”—this is the key-note of the first chapter of Mary Antin’s book. . . . “If we took our mission seriously—as seriously, say, as the Jews take theirs—we should live with a copy of our law at our side, and oblige every man who opened his mouth about it to square his doctrine with the gospel of liberty.” Such utterances are exalted, but strike one as a little extreme. They seem for the moment to ignore the old, painful necessity of compromise between ideal and fact—of taking thought for the morrow when we would like to live by faith alone. In close connection, however, with these expressions of faith occurs a more definite declaration of principle: “I do not ask that we remove all restrictions and let the flood of immigration sweep in unchecked. I do ask that such restrictions as we impose shall accord with the loftiest interpretation of our duty as Americans.” The author, then, stands on the practical ground where theories and conditions meet, and in one point, at least, she agrees heartily with the scientific restrictionists: the artificial stimulation of immigration must be stopped. No one has put the case against the importation of labor with more passion and point than has Mary Antin. But her discussion of the economic and sociological phases, which the fairness of her mind obliges her to consider, one finds less than convincing—not merely because she declines to thresh over all the statistical straw, but because one suspects a certain falsity of emphasis. It does not altogether quiet our economic doubts to be reminded that “in Texas alone there is room for the population of the whole world, with a homestead of half an acre for every family of five, and a patch the size of